

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 10/053,296
Page 8 of 11

REMARKS

This response is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated June 26, 2003. In view of the amendments and the following discussion, the Applicants believe that all claims are in allowable form.

CLAIM REJECTIONS

A. 35 U.S.C. §102(b) Claims 1-3 and 5

Claims 1-3 and 5 stand rejected as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 5,731,678 issued March 24, 1998 to *Zila et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Zila*"). In response, the Applicants have cancelled claims 1-3 and 5 without prejudice.

B. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 6

Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatentable over *Zila* as applied to claims 1-3 and 5 above, and in further view of United States Patent No. 6,469,448 October 22, 2002 to *Taguchi et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Taguchi*") and United States Patent No. 6,042,707 March 28, 2000 to *Moleshi et al.*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Moleshi*"). In response, the Applicants have rewritten claim 4 and amended claim 6.

Claim 4 has been rewritten in independent form to include the limitations of claims 1-2. The Examiner has indicated that claim 4, as rewritten, is patentable over the art of record. Claim 6 has been amended to depend from independent claim 4. As the Examiner has indicated that claim 4, as rewritten, is allowable, the Applicants respectfully submit that claim 6, as amended, is also patentable over the art of record. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claim 6 be withdrawn.

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 10/053,296
Page 9 of 11

C. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 11

Claim 11 stands rejected as being unpatentable over *Zila* in further view of *Taguchi*. In response, the Applicants have cancelled claim 11 without prejudice.

D. 35 U.S.C. §103(a) Claim 12

Claim 12 stands rejected as being unpatentable over *Zila* and *Taguchi* as applied to claim 12 above, and in further view of United States Patent No. 6,198,299 March 6, 2001 to *Hollman*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Hollman*") and United States Patent No. 4,416,102 November 22, 1983 to *Peters*, (hereinafter referred to as "*Peters*"). In response, the Applicants have cancelled claim 12 without prejudice.

ALLOWED CLAIMS

The Applicants thank the Examiner for her comments regarding the allowability of claim 16. The Applicants also thank the Examiner for her comments regarding the allowability of claims 4, 7-10 and 13-15 if rewritten in independent form to include base and all intervening claims.

In response, the Applicants have rewritten claims 4, 7 and 13 as suggested by the Examiner. Claims 5-6 and claims 14-15 have been respectively amended to depend from independent claims 4 and 13. Thus, the Applicants submit that claims 4-10 and 13-16 are now in allowable form.

NEW CLAIMS

New claims 17-28 have been added. The Applicants believe that no new matter has been entered. New claims 17-21 depend from independent claim 4. New claims 22-25 depends from independent claim 7. New claim 26 depends from independent claim 13. Claim 27 is a new independent claim and claim 28 depends therefrom. Thus, the Applicants submit that new claims 17-28 are all in allowable form.

Response to Office Action
Serial No. 10/053,296
Page 10 of 11

NEW CLAIMS 27-28

Independent claim 27 has been added and recites limitations similar to claim 1, which stands rejected as being anticipated by *Zila*. The Applicants submit that the invention of claim 27 is patentable over *Zila* as *Zila* fails to teach or suggest a chamber body having an evacuable interior volume, a substrate support coupled to the chamber body, and lid assembly moved by a motor relative the substrate support between a first position enclosing the interior volume and a second position. Thus, the Applicants submit that new claim 27 and claim 28 that depends therefrom, are allowable over the references of record.


CONCLUSION

Thus, the Applicant submits that all claims now pending are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, both reconsideration of this application and its swift passage to issuance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, the Examiner believes that any unresolved issues still exist, it is requested that the Examiner telephone Mr. Keith Taboada at (732) 530-9404 so that appropriate arrangements can be made for resolving such issues as expeditiously as possible.

Respectfully submitted,

Sept. 18, 2003



KEITH TABOADA, Attorney
Reg. No. 45,150
(732) 530-9404

Moser, Patterson & Sheridan, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue
Suite 100
Shrewsbury, NJ 07702